

his home in Prescott, Arizona, and to celebrate the life of this true American original—inventor, manufacturer and business owner.

Although he was not New Hampshire born, Bill Ruger embodied the best of the Granite State. He blazed his own trail, and in the process, turned his name into a recognizable symbol of ingenuity and workmanship.

A native of Brooklyn, Bill Ruger was interested in firearms for virtually his entire life. He received his first rifle from his father at age 12, and as a teenager, read and studied as much as he could on firearms; the history of firearms, their design and how they are manufactured. Bill carried his passion for firearms to the University of North Carolina where as a student he turned a vacant room into a machine shop. His interest in firearms was so keen that while in his early 20's, Bill developed the preliminary plans for a light machine gun for use by the Army.

After two years at North Carolina, Bill left to work at what he loved. He took a job in a gun factory and eventually opened his own business as a toolmaker; a business which did not succeed. Still, during that time, Bill kept experimenting with firearm designs, eventually perfecting a design for a .22 caliber pistol.

In 1949, with a \$50,000 investment from his partner, Alexander Sturm, Bill Ruger founded a firearm manufacturing business in a "little red barn" in Southport, Connecticut. As business increased, Sturm, Ruger and Company expanded, opening new plants including a plant in Newport, New Hampshire in 1963 to produce its own firearms components instead of paying others to do the same. Today, Sturm, Ruger and Company is world-renowned for its more than 50 models of revolvers, police sidearms, target pistols, rifles and shotguns, and has developed a reputation for quality in specialized castings for products in the aerospace field, the automobile industry, medicine and the sport of golf. The company has grown to become America's largest firearms manufacturer and one of New Hampshire's largest employers; all under the watchful eye of Bill Ruger.

Bill Ruger valued his employees and their craftsmanship and would never sell a product he would not have been proud to own himself. This attention to excellence is a fact to which generations of firearms owners, police officers and military personnel will attest.

Beyond the success Bill Ruger enjoyed as a firearms manufacturer, he had many other pursuits and interests including his collection of antique firearms, 19th Century Western American art, and antique automobiles and was particularly known as a generous and charitable man who gave of himself and his finances.

The foundation of his life, though, was his family—his son, William Ruger Jr., who now heads the family business; his daughter, Carolyn Vogel; his six grandchildren, and 10 great-grandchildren. Each held a special place in his heart, as did the memory of his lovely wife, Mary Thompson Ruger, who passed away in 1994, and that of his late son, James Thompson ("Tom") Ruger.

In New Hampshire, Bill Ruger's legacy will remain for decades to come. He was an American original, and those of us fortunate enough to have been able to know Bill will truly miss him.

## NEW ALLIES, OLD FORMULA

### HON. NORMAN D. DICKS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 18, 2002*

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my deep concern about the undemocratic and totalitarian actions of the President of Kazakhstan, Nursultan Nazarbayev. He has recently banned several opposition parties, arrested and exiled their leaders, and has made the formation of new parties virtually impossible. He has shut down many newspapers and television stations in Kazakhstan, preventing its citizens from having a free press. Furthermore, President Nazarbayev has reportedly placed \$1 billion dollars of oil revenue into a secret Swiss bank account.

This behavior should not be tolerated and I believe it is important at this time to focus international attention on this situation. President Nazarbayev needs to allow for all legitimate opposition parties and their leaders to run for public office and allow for all exiled political leaders to return to Kazakhstan. He must also allow for a free press, the foundation of any democracy. President Nazarbayev should be held accountable for widespread corruption, including the placement of government funds into secret Swiss bank accounts. I am asking that we insert into the RECORD a July 12th editorial written by the Washington Post Editorial Board which more fully describes the injustices currently occurring in Kazakhstan. [the article follows]

[The Washington Post—Friday, July 12, 2002]

## NEW ALLIES, OLD FORMULA

As the United States rushed to strengthen ties to the countries of Central Asia after Sept. 11, one question that quickly arose was whether the new military agreements and economic packages would serve only to bolster the repressive rule of the region's autocrats or whether U.S. influence would also be used to bring about political and economic reform. Some 10 months later the first answers are in, and they are at best mixed. The region's most repressive ruler, Islam Karimov of Uzbekistan, has also proved to be the one most eager to forge a close relationship with Washington; consequently, his government has responded to concerted pressure from the Bush administration with a few modest concessions and promises of more. Elsewhere, however, a couple of new allies may have concluded that their new utility as U.S. security partners empowers them to repress their domestic opponents all the more forcefully.

Nursultan Nazarbayev, the president of Kazakhstan, certainly seems untroubled by any imperative to accept Western norms of democracy or human rights. Though his huge, oil-rich country once appeared to be leading the former Soviet republics of the region in reforming the old system, it has, since Sept. 11, moved steadily in the opposite direction. Mr. Nazarbayev, a former member of the Soviet Politburo who took over Kazakhstan when it became independent and has ruled it ever since, did not take kindly to the formation of an opposition party by former government officials late last year. He arrested and tried several of its leaders, and recently he had his rubber-stamp parliament pass a new law making the legal formation of such parties virtually impossible. The president also did not like reading reports in the Kazakh media about a secret Swiss bank account in which he deposited \$1

billion in oil revenue. A score of newspapers and an equal number of television stations have been forced to shut down in recent months, and a number of journalists have been attacked or threatened.

Mr. Nazarbayev has arrogantly dismissed U.S. complaints about his behavior, just as he has waved off suggestions that he consider allowing more democracy. Instead, he seems to be modeling himself on the long-time U.S. allies in the Persian Gulf. Rather than reform, he signs drilling and pipeline deals that will allow his country to rake in billions in oil income; rather than respect human rights, he offers cooperation with the U.S. military. Just this week his government formalized an agreement with the Bush administration that will allow emergency landings and refuelings for U.S. military planes at Almaty's international airport.

Bush administration officials say they understand that accepting a relationship on such terms is more than a political embarrassment. "Authoritarian governments and largely unreformed economies," Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Lynn Pascoe told a recent congressional hearing, "create the conditions of repression and poverty that could well become the breeding grounds for further terrorism." The question, then, is how to break the old model that Mr. Nazarbayev would renew. As in the Persian Gulf, admonitions from ambassadors, and even rhetoric from the White House, will not be enough; Mr. Nazarbayev must understand that his country's relationship with the United States depends on political change. Does the Pentagon really need another landing arrangement in Central Asia? If such agreements were withheld—or frozen—Mr. Nazarbayev and other Central Asian dictators would be quick to get the message.

## CONDOLENCES TO FAMILY AND FRIENDS OF SAMATHA RUNNION

### HON. EDWARD R. ROYCE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 18, 2002*

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my condolences to the family and friends of Samatha Runnion, and to all those who have been affected by her tragic murder.

Samantha was abducted from her home in Stanton, California, on Monday, July 15. She was sexually assaulted and murdered, and her body was found the next day in Cleveland National Forest.

President George W. Bush has called on Attorney General John Ashcroft and FBI Director Robert Mueller to order that all federal resources necessary be made available to the Orange County sheriff's office. Rewards totaling more than \$100,000 have been offered by British Petroleum, which employs Samantha's mother, the Coalition of Police and Sheriffs in Santa Ana and others.

What happened to Samantha is deeply disturbing. Why does something like this have to happen to an innocent child? We shouldn't have to keep children off the streets. They should be allowed to go out and play, without fear of such horrendous acts. Parents shouldn't have to worry about their children disappearing the moment they turn their backs.

Sadly, the television has recently been strewn with alarming news of missing children like Samantha, Elizabeth Smart, Jahi Turner,

and others. We hope that justice will be served, but even finding those accountable gives just a slightly cathartic feeling after such a huge loss. Our hearts go out to Samantha's family, the families of these other children, and anyone else feeling the pain of losing a child.

“WATCH WHAT WE DO, NOT WHAT WE SAY”

**HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 18, 2002*

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, over the past few months, we have seen one revelation after another about the conflicts of interest rampant among figures of the Bush Administration, from the President and Vice President, themselves, to senior officials in key agencies. We have had a veritable cornucopia of conflicts. Almost every day, the media has uncovered a new one. It reminds me of a prophetic invitation made by John Mitchell, President Nixon's first Attorney General. Before we learned the scope of Watergate, Mitchell asked the American people to:

WATCH WHAT WE DO—NOT WHAT WE SAY

Well we watched what Mr. Mitchell did, as he requested. And John Mitchell went to jail. His advice seems particularly pertinent these days. Practically every senior official of the Bush Administration has made pious speeches about the importance of business ethics, professional integrity and scrupulous avoidance of conflict of interest. That's what they have said.

But when we examine what they have done, the chasm between their sermons and their actions is striking. That sharp contrast angers ordinary citizens who have been laid off, or seen their nest egg investments evaporate, or their pensions become worthless. Why should they be angry? Let me count the ways.

DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL LARRY THOMPSON

The head of the President's so-called “Swat Team” on corporate crime is Deputy Attorney General Larry Thompson. He already has rejected my call, months ago, for him to recuse himself from the Department's decisions in the Enron scandal. I did so because Thompson had received benefits from—and might be receiving a pension from—a law firm that has substantially represented Enron. That raised a serious possibility that he could not vigorously pursue the case against Enron. At the least, I asked him to explain his decision if he did not recuse himself.

Now Thompson has pledged to the public that he will hunt down corporate criminals “with vigor and aggressive manner.” Yet Thompson was on the board of Providian Financial Corporation and chaired its compliance and audit committee, at a time when—to put it very charitably—Providian was not only unscrupulously enticing and exploiting the poorest class of debtors, but also inflating earnings by excessive charges and by shady lender practices that violated federal and state consumer protection rules. Thompson's spokesman has claimed that he only learned of these practices when regulators made inquiries. His spokesman actually claimed that Thompson was owed applause for helping to settle the claims. Well I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, but if he was chairman of Providian's compli-

ance committee and was unaware his corporation was badly out of compliance, then I have to wonder if he's fit to manage the Department of Justice.

It's bad enough for someone with the sensitivities Thompson should have, that Providian's growth relied on pursuing customers with poor credit card histories, who have difficulty obtaining further credit, misled them into accepting excessive interest rates and hidden charges, and denied the customary grace period for delinquent credit card payments. Apparently, Thompson, and other executive insiders, dumped large blocks of stock knowing that the reported revenues were overstated because of these unlawful practices. And worse still—just like the Enron officials Thompson is supposed to be investigating—the Providian executives sold their company stock while recommending purchase of large holdings of that stock to the employees 401 K plan. It is true that Thompson would have had to sell his shares in the company in connection with his nomination; but there is no suggestion yet that he was going to act any differently than his Providian colleagues, even before his nomination.

ARMY SECRETARY THOMAS WHITE

Thomas White was Vice President of Enron's Energy Services Unit, one of the company's components engaged in its most egregious accounting practices. In 1981, between June and October he unloaded over \$12 million worth of Enron stock. Investigators are assessing whether he violated insider trading laws. In addition he first hid the full number of contacts he had with Enron officials after he had assumed federal office. Then he admitted to having 84 phone calls with company officials in his first 10 months as Army Secretary. He also failed to comply with the ethics laws in divesting himself in a timely manner of all of his Enron shares and options. As in Larry Thompson's case, if White's dubious claims are true that he was unaware of the corporation's phony accounting, it is hard to have confidence in his ability to manage operations and procurement involving billions of dollars.

In sum, I cannot put his offensive situation any better than a New York Times Editorial that said: “Army Secretary Thomas White has repeatedly pledged that, if questions stemming from his ties to Enron became too much of a distraction, he would resign. They now have and he should.”

PRESIDENT BUSH

The numerous serious questions raised about President's Bush's relationship with Harken Energy while he served on its board have been widely reported in the press. These principally include the circumstances under which he received several loans to purchase company stock; and under which he sold stock with knowledge of negative business news that was about to be made public. Obviously such serious charges require a thorough airing. In the meanwhile, the public will have to make its own judgment as to whether the President's corporate experience makes it inappropriate for him to so sternly lecture the private sector on the importance of the highest ethical standards for American business.

VICE PRESIDENT CHENEY

A major Securities and Exchange Commission investigation is underway of oil services giant Halliburton Corporation. Among other activities at issue are Halliburton accounting

practices, which were parallel to those of other corporations now under current public scrutiny. Vice President CHENEY was not merely a vice president or division chief at Halliburton, Mr. Speaker, he was the CEO. He was in charge. Polls have shown that 53 percent of the American people believe he is either lying or hiding something about his involvement in Halliburton's questionable corporate practices. This is hardly surprising since the Nation is already suspicious about Mr. CHENEY's refusal to make public his secret meetings with oil industry executives lobbying his energy policy task force behind the scenes. Yet the Vice President refuses to disclose his records regarding his role in these Halliburton transactions. He won't even talk about this troubling matter, even though there is no law, regulation or rule that he has been able to cite that would prevent him from doing so.

The Vice President says that whenever the SEC asks him for information, he will cooperate fully. . . . But that raises a catch 22 problem because the head of the SEC, Chairman Harvey Pitt, himself has two conflicts of interest that are equally serious

HARVEY PITT

First, as is now widely known, Mr. Pitt for years was private lapdog of almost every major accounting firm and numerous banking clients. His bona fides to conduct vigorous investigation of past wrongdoing and oversight of future conduct are highly suspect. This is especially disturbing because his one year “probation period” under the Ethics Law is about to end. He then will be free even to participate in cases involving his former clients. To be sure, in recent weeks, Chairman Pitt has missed no opportunity to proclaim how tough he plans to be on corporate criminals. But last fall, he was telling people that what the private sector needed was a “kinder, gentler SEC.” This year he strongly lobbied for the far weaker Oxley bill to regulate corporate misbehavior, rather than the tough Sarbanes bill that passed the Senate unanimously last week.

Second, it will not be credible to the American public that Mr. Pitt will really pull out all the stops to investigate wrongdoing by the Halliburton and Harken corporations and “let the chips fall where they may” regarding any culpable involvement of the President or the Vice President. As James Madison sagely advised over two hundred years ago, “If men were angels,” we would need no government watchdogs. Even if we were convinced that Mr. Pitt is an honorable man, none of us are angels. It is too much to expect that he will supervise investigations which may involve his bosses, President Bush and Vice President CHENEY, without being influenced one iota by their relationship to him. The inherent conflict is just too great.

Therefore, I call on Chairman Pitt to appoint a widely respected Special Counsel to the SEC, clearly independent of Pitt's chain of command authority, to conduct those investigations, as well as any investigation involving Pitt's former clients. Should he and the Department of Justice determine he lacks full authority to do so, then I call on them to present to the House and Senate the necessary legislation to provide that authority, so that we may enact it expeditiously.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with President Bush and the other outspoken Administration officials that it is essential to restore public confidence in American corporate ethics, investor